DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 299 824 FL 017 627

AUTHOR El-Banna, Adel Ibrahim
TITLE Deductive versus Inductive Teaching of Grammar: An Experimental Investigation.
PUB DATE 85
NOTE 55p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cognitive Ability; *Deduction; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; *Grammar; Higher Education; *Induction; Instructional Effectiveness; Intensive Language Courses; Learning Processes; *Second Language Instruction; Sex Differences; Teaching Methods; Verbal Ability
IDENTIFIERS *Tanta University (Egypt)

ABSTRACT

An experiment investigated the effectiveness of teaching grammar by deductive versus inductive methods in an intensive course in English as a second language. Additional student variables considered were general intelligence, verbal ability, cognitive ability, and sex. The subjects were 259 students in the Faculty of Education at Egypt's Tanta University. Data were gathered using three tests of English syntax, intelligence, and cognitive and verbal ability. Analysis of the results revealed no significant overall difference in effect between the two instructional approaches. However, differences were found related to level of intelligence, verbal ability, cognitive ability, and sex. Interactions between approach and general intelligence, verbal ability, and sex were not found, but there was a significant interaction between approach and cognitive ability. Based on these findings, it is recommended that grammar instruction not be limited to either approach but use both as the situation warrants. Ten tables and 41 references are included and a copy of the test of English syntax is appended. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 299824

UNIVERSITY OF TANTA
FACULTY OF EDUCATION

DEDUCTIVE VERSUS INDUCTIVE TEACHING OF GRAMMAR:AN EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION

BY
Adel Ibrahim El-Banna,Ph.D.
EFL Teaching & Testing

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A. El-Banna
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

(c) 1985
By Adel I. El-Banna.

FL 017 687

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UNIVERSITY OF TANTA
FACULTY OF EDUCATION

DEDUCTIVE VERSUS INDUCTIVE TEACHING OF GRAMMAR: AN EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION

By

Adel Ibrahim El-Banna, Ph.D.
EFL Teaching & Testing

FL017627

c 1985
By Adel I. El-Banna

Deductive Versus Inductive Teaching of Grammar: An Experimental Investigation

Adel I. El-Banna
Tanta University, Faculty of Education

ABSTRACT

The present experimental investigation was designed to study the effectiveness of deductive and inductive approaches, the impact of general intelligence, verbal ability and thinking ability on the teaching of grammar, and to study differences between males and females when taught by the two approaches. Interactions between approaches and sex; approaches and verbal ability; and approaches and thinking ability were also investigated. Tanta University Language Proficiency Test of English Syntax, Test of Primary Intellectual Abilities and Test of High Intelligence were administered in 1985, to 259 subjects, 116 males and 143 females enrolled in the Faculty of Education at Kafr El-Sheikh. The experimental groups were taught an intensive course in English grammar and teaching the experimental groups lasted for seven weeks. A 2x2 analysis of variance, the t-test for independent groups, simple coefficients of correlation, and partial coefficients of correlations were performed on the data. Research findings disclosed no significant difference between the deductive and the inductive approaches. However, significant differences were revealed between students with high general intelligence and those with low general intelligence in favour of students of high general intelligence; significant differences were also found between students with high verbal ability and those with low verbal ability in favour of students of high verbal ability; and significant differences were revealed between students of high thinking ability and those with low thinking ability in favour of students of high thinking ability. Significant differences were also indicated between males and females. No significant interactions were disclosed between the two

approaches and general intelligence, verbal ability, and sex. Significant interaction, however, was found between the two approaches and thinking ability. On the basis of the findings, it is recommended that any steps taken to teach the grammatical structures of the language should not be limited to utilizing either a deductive or an inductive approach but rather making use of both approaches as the occasion would seem to demand. (ten tables are included).

INTRODUCTION

As is true in many areas of language teaching today, the teaching of grammar is full of controversy. Grammar pervades all language skills and the objective of teaching it is the correct use of the target language for communicative purposes. Jespersen (1972) stated that the chief objective of teaching grammar today ,especially that of a foreign language is to give rules which must be obeyed if one wants to speak and write the language correctly.

To many teachers, learning a foreign language is basically a question of grammar. One hears the complaint that students were never any good at learning languages because they could not remember the grammar of the language (Gurrey, 1973, P. 70). Therefore, grammar teaching is so popular in many schools and colleges and with many teachers for many reasons. One reason is that it is possible for a teacher to teach the grammar of a language although he or she has no real command over that language. The second reason is that grammar is popular with examiners. It is difficult to test good speaking ability or writing ability. Grammar questions are easy to set and correct. Moreover, many examiners are elderly; they learned their English under a grammatical system. The third reason is that directors and inspectors of education demand grammar. They observed that the students in the schools speak and write ungrammatically and say, "Therefore, teach them more grammar". The fourth reason is that some experts in education demand it "Grammar gives a training in reasoning" (West, 1979, PP. 34-35).

Unlike teachers of the native language, the teachers of a foreign language do not throw doubt upon the pressing need for teaching the grammar of a new language. They, however, have considerable doubts about how this grammar should be taught (Gurrey, 1973, P. 70).

Grammatical lists, together with grammar rules given in the target language or in the mother tongue are intended

as aids in learning the forms of the foreign language. Explanations in the mother tongue or in the foreign language and translations deal with the meaning are presented to the students in order to help them learn the language. Such grammar translation approaches are widely used in many Egyptian schools and colleges. Rivers (1981, P. 93), maintained that some variations stemmed from the attitudes of the teachers toward grammar. Some teachers said, "It is tremendously important that the students know their grammar", "While other teachers maintained that students can speak and write their native language with easc" "without knowing any grammar", and that a knowledge of grammar should therefore not be required of the person learning another language, Yet others maintained that students cannot use their native language properly in speech and writing because they were never "taught grammar". So, the controversy goes on and the same thing applies to the teaching of grammar.

At this point, it would seem necessary to present the different methods or approaches by which EFL/ESL learners might be taught with particular emphasis on the teaching of grammar. To the methodology theorists of EFL and ESL the importance of grammar has waxed and waned. Therefore, it would seem essential for a perfect understanding of this problem, to survey in brief these differing methodologies, and how and why they gained acceptance, and in some cases, opposition.

a- <u>The Grammar-Translation Method</u>:

With this method of teaching the language, as the name implies, grammar is of essential importance. It provides the rules for putting words together and it is taught in a very formal way.

b- <u>The Direct Method</u>:

In reaction to the formal nature of "The Grammar Translation Method," the direct method came with its focus on

speaking and listening. According to the tenets of this method, grammar is not taught, rather as the learners become familiar with the language so, it is thought, they will acquire the basic grammatical structures.

c- The Reading Method:

Here, where reading is the basic criterion for learning a language, as much grammar as is necessary to understand the written word is taught.

d- The Audio-Lingual Method:

This method, which became famous in the 1960's was based to a large extent on the behaviourist theories of psychologists. It also took much from the direct method while reacting against the reading method. This method is based upon the notion that language learning is a process of habit formation and that the repetitive drills are the key to the mastery of language skills. Grammar is not taught as a separate entity but as something that will be learned through the use of repetitive drills.

e- The Cognitive Method:

This methodology came as a reaction to the audiolingual method. For the advocates of the cognitive method maintain that language is not a matter of habit but of thought, basing their notions on Chomsky's theories. He stated that language learning is a creative process, "a rationalistic, cognitive activity rather than a response to outside stimuli" (Newton, 1979, P. 19).

Advocates of this method tend to think that grammar should be taught deductively, that is, learners are given a grammatical rule with so many examples before they practise the use of a certain structure. This is opposed to the inductive approach suggested by the audio-linguists where learners see a rule in operation, practise its use and then

deduce the rule for themselves.

Thus, the cognitive method requires of learners "an abstract comprehension of the workings of the grammatical system", thinking that, "this basic knowledge is indispensable for effective language use" (Rivers and Temperley, 1978, P. 277).

Consequently, it is obvious that language teachers down the ages have faced a choice between these two approaches, namely the deductive and inductive approaches. On one hand, most teachers are always worried about the fact that grammar rules were not systematically presented, explained and learned in an inductive approach. They proposed a return to explaining grammar rules first, thus involving learners' reasoning processes in language Learning (Rivers, 1981, P. 78). On the other hand, transformational-generative grammarians arrive at their linguistic rules by a process of induction, as does Chomsky's hypothesis-testing first language learning.

To clairfy, formalists have relied mostly on a deductive form of teaching, moving from the statement of the rule to its application in the example (Rivers, 1981, PP. 25-26; Rivers and Temperley, 1978, P. 275), whereas activists have avocated the comprehension by students themselves of the way the language is working. They prefer students to develop a rule or generalization themselves after they had heard or seen certain forms and used them in a number of way; this is a process of inductive learning moving from examples to rules (Rivers, 1981; Rivers and Temperley, 1978).

Diller (1970 , PP. 16-18) advocated an inductive approach. He points out that knowing a rule and being able to act on it is quite independent of being able to formulate the rule adequately. The rule can be psychologically real without any formulation of it. Rules for action are best learned in conjuction with demonstration and practice of action.

Rivers and Temperley (1978) also recommended that grammar is well learned inductively and through action rather than through deductive grammar rules. Abbott and Wingard (1981, PP. 282-283) maintained that " the practical rules we do use must be based on an appreciation of up-to-date usage, not simply an ancient traditions". They added that "Plenty of practice is needed for mastery of the grammatical patterns by which notions and functions are realized".

On the contrary, most teachers of English imagine that intellectual explanations are more effective in teaching than practice and application, as if learning a language were purely an intellectual affair (Gurrey, 1973, P. 76). It is quite obvious that those teachers stick to the traditional approach of grammar teaching. This may be due to some reasons. These can be summarized as follows: (a) They have been taught by this method; (b) It is the oldest and most prevelant method in language teaching; (c) It does not require too much work on the part of the teacher. The teacher has to write down the rule and the learners have to memorize it.

Gurrey (1973, P. 72) recommended deductive exercises for learning the main rules of the target language. Nevertheless, he also recommends that the greater part of learning should not be listening to explanations by the teacher, but applying what has been learned by rote or analogy or observation. He added that "Grammar can be made very simple or a usage may become evident through a large number of easy exercises when the brighter students can deduce the rule, but for the majority this often fails".

Garroll (1971, P. 112) saw a place for habit formation as well as rule learning in language teaching. As for an inductive versus a deductive presentation, Carroll pointed out that neither alone is adequate; for effective teaching there must be considerable alternation between rules and examples. It hardly matters whether one starts with the rule

or the example as long as this alternation exists. It is quite obvious that Carroll calls for using both approaches in teaching grammar.

Chastain (1971) also maintained a deductive approach. she put it clearly by stating that "one basic tenet of the cognitive approach that students never expected to meet new structures prior to the explanations of those forms" (P. 48). In discussing "cognitive materials, Chastain indicated that "a cognitive book would not proceed in an inductive fashion.... A cognitive book would proceed from focus on structural forms and functions to exercises, to reading." (P. 48).

Finally, this author would like to cite Lado (1981, P. 238) who had some final say in this matter. Lado stated that "the ambivalence of the profession toward the formal study of grammar will remain with us during the 1980's, that is, there will continue to be disagreement between those who, regardless of theoretical discussions, believe that the study and teaching of a second language is fundamentally the study of grammar, on one hand, and those who abhor the formal study and teaching of grammar in any form, on the other hand, "Lado, however, concluded saying that some sort of formalization or confirmation of rules seems hard to ignore or dismiss."

To add, since the pendulum of teaching methodologies swings from grammar-translation through audio-lingual to congnitive code learning and back to grammar translation, it is no wonder that teachers are confused. Many teachers adopt a deductive approach in teaching the grammatical structures of the language while others prefer and recommend an inductive approach in better teaching grammar rules.

From the previous discussion, it is clear that there is no consensus of opinion on how should grammar be taught. Therefore, the question which interests this author is that when teaching grammar to EFL/ESL learners, should it be taught deductively or inductively?

Purpose of the study:

The present study was intended as an experimental investigation. Two objectives were set forth in designing it. The first objective was to investigate the effectiveness of two different approaches, that is, the deductive and inductive approaches used in teaching English grammar to EFL learners. It was thought, too, that knowledge of the effectiveness of the two approaches would be helpful in developing more appropriate teaching approaches and procedures with regard to grade level and English language proficiency. The second objective of this study was to examine the impact of general intelligence, verbal ability and thinking ability on the teaching of grammar by using both the deductive and the inductive approaches. Moreover differences between males and females taught by means of the two approaches employed in the study were also investigated.

The need for this study was promoted by:

(a) Paucity of research work related to the teaching of English grammar to EFL learners using both the deductive and the inductive approaches.

(b) The teaching of grammar to EFL learners presents problems since EFL teachers often do not have clearly in mind how to better teach grammar and which approach is better in teaching. Most teachers do not have valid criteria for determining the most appropriate approaches and procedures of teaching grammar.

Questions of the study:

Since the basic objectives of this study was to examine the effectiveness of two different approaches of teaching grammar and to study the effect of some other variables on teaching grammar, the main research questions were:

1- Is there any difference between the deductive group and the inductive group?

2- Is there any difference between subjects with high general intelligence and those with low general intelligence?
3- Is there any difference between subjects with high verbal ability and those with low verbal ability?
4- Is there any difference between subjects with high thinking ability and those with low thinking ability?
5- Is there any difference between males and females?
6- Is there any interaction between the approaches, and general intelligence, verbal ability, thinking ability and sex?
7- Is there any bilateral relationship between the two groups and the whole sample in general intelligence, verbal ability and thinking ability?

Instruments:

To obtain the necessary data to examine the validity of the study's hypotheses, some tests were selected and constructed. These tests were:

1- Test of Primary Intellectual Abilities (Ahmed Z. Saleh, no date).

This test measures general intelligence and is divided into four sub-tests measuring different mental abilities. These are: verbal ability, spatial perception, thinking ability and numerical ability. The test is both valid and reliable and has been used in many studies. The sub-tests employed in the present study were: verbal ability and thinking ability.

2- Test of High Intelligence (El-Sayed M. Khayry, no date).

This test measures what is called "general intelligence", and consists of forty-two items graded in difficulty. It requires approximately 30 minutes of working time. It is divided into five sub-tests measuring different mental functions. Both the validity and the reliability of the test have been estimated and the test has been used in many studies.

3- Tanta University Language Proficiency Test of English Syntax For Non-Native Speakers of English (Developed by the author, see Appendix A).

This test is a content based test, the most significant areas in English grammar are tested. The selection of the areas to be tested is based on content analysis, the judgement of a panel of experts in language teaching and language testing and the writer's experience concerning the importance of these areas. The test is of the multiple-choice variety and consists of a 100 items measuring different points of English structure, and requires approximately 60 minutes of working time.

The test is content valid because during its development, considerable attention was given to making the test content representative. In addition, the test was submitted to a panel of experts to judge its validity. The test reliability was calculated by applying the split-half procecure to the scores obtained by the 259 subjects. It was found to be .79.

Subjects:

The sample of the present study consisted of 259 subjects (116 males and 143 females), first year EFL students enrolled in the Faculty of Education Tanta University. The sample included nearly all the students admitted to the different departments in the academic year 1985. These departments were: Biology, Physics, Chemistry, Mathematics and Arabic. The whole sample was assigned at random to the two approaches of teaching grammar, that is, the deductive and inductive approaches. Before the experiment, a pretest was given to the two groups to make sure that the subjects are equivalent in their previous knowledge in grammatical structures. Table 1 shows the results of pretesting the two experimental groups.

Table (1): Group Size, Means and Standard Deviations of the Two Experimental Groups

Approaches	Pretest scores			F	t
	N	$\bar{X}$	S D		
Deductive	121	57.26	15.95	1.04	1.03
Inductive	138	55.62	15.67		

It is clear from table one that there are no significant differences in the mean scores of the two experimental groups before carrying out the experiment.

To achieve maximum control, this author tried to control some other important variables related to the present study. These were general intelligence, verbal ability, thinking ability, English language score and the total scores of the Thanawiyya Amma. The results are shown in table 2.

Table (2): Group Size, Means and Standard Deviations of Variables Related to the study

Variables	Deductive group			Inductive group			F	t
	N	$\bar{X}$	S D	N	$\bar{X}$	S D		
General Intelligence	121	37.5	24.45	138	25.35	19.25	1.61	5.28**
Verbal Ability	121	40.59	21.42	138	33.74	21.44	1.002	3.20*
Thinking Ability	121	34.30	26.68	138	26.19	23.68	1.27	3.14*
English language scores	121	26.47	8.81	138	26.59	7.65	1.33	0.14
Total of Thanawiyya Amma scores	121	232.17	40.32	138	230.73	51.69	1.64	0.33

* Significant at the .05 level.

** Significant at the .01 level.

The results in table 2 shows that there are significant differences in the mean scores of the two experimental groups in general intelligence verbal ability and thinking ability. No significant differences, however, were found between the two groups in the English language score or in the total of the Thanawiyya Amma scores. This simply means that the two groups are equivalent in both the language level and the Thanawiyya Amma level. However, the two groups were not equivalent in general intelligence, verbal ability and thinking ability. Since this writer's intention was to study the impact of general intelligence, verbal ability and thinking ability on the two approaches, that is, the deductive and the inductive approaches, these variables were included in the study as main variables.

Teaching the experimental groups:

The two experimental groups were assigned at random to the two approaches. They were taught an intensive course in English grammar (Dixon, 1972 a, and Dixon, 1972 b). Two teachers were also assigned randomly to teach the two groups and the experiment lasted for seven weeks.

1- Deductive grammar teaching:

In a deductive approach, the rules or patterns are presented to the learners and they then are given ample time to practice the new feature of grammar (Allen and Valette, 1981, PP. 85-99; Abbott and Wingard, 1981). According to this approach, the deductive presentation of grammar followed this general procedure:

(a) Statement of the rule or pattern;
(b) Sample sentences that students repeat; and
(c) Enough time for students to practice the new rule.

The first presentation is usually made orally. When the

students can hadle the spoken pattern or rule, they are introduced to the written form. For more complex patterns, the teacher may present the written patterns first and then allow for oral practice afterwards.

2- Inductive grammar teaching:

In an inductive approach, the teacher first gives the learners examples of the grammatical structures to be learned. After the examples have been practised, the learners are guided in forming a generalization about the rule they have been working with and then practice using the structure. The inductive presentation of grammar followed this general procedure:

(a) Presentation of examples;
(b) Oral or written practice; and
(c) Rule that develops of the previous activity.

Tests Administration and Scoring:

After the experiment had been carried out, the two experimental groups were given a post test, that is, "Tanta University Language Proficiency Test of English Syntax". The test was administered in two separate sessions during the same day and lasted for 60 minutes each. The subjects recorded their answers to the test items on separate answer sheets which were then scored manually by this author.

Results:

The data obtained were subjected to some statistical procedures and the hypotheses were tested by utilizing Two Way Analysis of Variance (Hinkle et al., 1979, P. 322); the t-test for independent groups (Hinkle, 1979, PP. 202-209), simple coefficient of correlation and partial coefficient

of correlation (Hinkle, 1979, PP. 382-384; and P. 75). To deal with the problem of this study, seven null hypotheses were set to be tested.

Hypothesis One: There is no significant difference in the mean scores of the deductive group and that of the inductive group. To identify the mean differences, if any, existed between the two groups, table 3 shows group size, the means, standard deviations and the t-test.

Table (3): Group size, the Means, Standard Deviations and the t-test for the Two Approaches

Approaches	N	$\bar{X}$	S D	F	t-test
Deductive Group	121	62.30	14.32	1.27	1.41
Inductive Group	138	60.20	16.25		

As table 3 indicates, using the t-test showed no significant differences between the two approaches, Therefore, the first null hypothesis was accepted. The same data were also subjected to a more accurate statistical procedure, that is, ANOVA to make sure that no significant differences do exist between the two approaches and to study interaction, if any, existed between the two approaches and general intelligence (see table 4).

Table (4): ANOVA (2x2) for the Deductive and the Inductive Groups and General Intelligence

Source	MS	d.f	SS	F
Approaches	268.94	1	268.94	1.16
General Intelligence	1027.89	1	1027.89	4.45*
Interaction	534.81	1	534.81	2.32
Within Groups	58908.62	259-4= 255	231.01	

* Significant at the .05 level.

To investigate the correlation between the grammar variable and general intelligence, this author used the multiple partial coefficient of correlation. The result was that the partial coefficient of correlation between the grammar variable and general intelligence was .50.

Hypothesis two: There is no significant difference in the mean scores of subjects with high general intelligence and that of subjects with low general intelligence. Using ANOVA (2x2) showed that significant differences in general intelligence exist (see table 4, P. 13). However, no significant differences were found between the two approaches. This result supports the findings of using the t-test as shown in table 3, P. 13. The results also showed no significant interaction. Accordingly, the second hypothesis was partly supported and partly rejected (see table 4, P. 13).

To identify the differences, the results of using the t-test indicated that significant mean differences exist between subjects with high general intelligence and those with low general intelligence in favour of subjects of high general intelligence as shown in table 5.

Table (5): The t-test for the Mean Differences Between High General Intelligence and Low General Intelligence

Groups	N	$\bar{X}$	S D	F	t-test
High Intelligence	121	64.04	14.54	1.16	2.33*
Low Intelligence	138	59.02	15.69		

* Significant at the .05 level.

Hypothesis three: There is no significant difference in the mean scores of subjects with high verbal ability and that of subjects with low verbal ability. As indicated in table 6, using ANOVA (2x2) showed significant mean differences between subjects with high verbal ability and those with low verbal ability. The results, however, showed no significant mean differences between the two approaches. This result supports the findings shown in table 3, P. 13 ; and table 4, P. 13 . The results also indicated no interaction between the approaches and verbal ability. Therefore, hypothesis three was partly supported and partly rejected.

Table (6): ANOVA (2x2) For the Deductive and Inductive Groups and Verbal Ability

Source	SS	d.f	MS	F
Approaches	87.75	1	87.75	0.40
Verbal Ability	4216.82	1	4216.82	19.05**
Interaction	254.61	1	254.61	1.15
Within Groups	56432.76	259-4= 255	221.30	

** Significant at the .01 level.

To investigate the correlation between the grammar variable and verbal ability, the multiple partial coefficient of correlation was used. It was .88.

To determine the direction of the differences between subjects with high verbal ability and those with low verbal ability, the t-test was used. As table 7 indicates, there is significant difference between the two groups in favour of high verbal ability group.

Table (7): The t-test for the Mean Difference Between High Verbal Ability Group and that of Low Berbal Ability

Groups	N	$\bar{X}$	S D	F	t-test
High verbal Ability	138	65.26	13.64	1.38*	t=2.45**
Low verbal Ability	121	56.80	16.02		t` =2.36
					t > t`

* Significant at the .05 level.

** Significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis four: There is no significant difference in the mean scores of subjects with high thinking ability and that of subjects with low thinking ability. Using ANOVA (2x2) showed that there is significant mean difference between the two groups taught by the two approaches, that is, the deductive and the inductive approaches (see table 8). The results also indicated significant interaction between the thinking ability and the two approaches. No significant differences, however, were found between the deductive and the inductive approaches. This result adds support to the previous findings in table 3, P. 13; table 4, P. 13; and table 6, P. 15). Accordingly, hypothesis four was partly supported and partly rejected.

Table (8): ANOVA (2x2) for the Deductive and the Inductive Groups and the Thinking Ability

Source	SS	d.f	MS	F
Approaches	82.74	1	82.74	0.38
Thinking Ability	2914.94	1	2914.94	13.24**
Interaction	1309.75	1	1309.75	5.95*
Within Groups	56150.43	259-4=255	200.20	

* Significant at the 0.05 level.

** Significant at the 0.01 level.

To study the correlation between the grammar variable and thinking ability, the multiple partial correlation coefficient was utilized. It was .64.

When the t-test was used to investigate the direction of differences, it indicated significant differences between subjects with high thinking ability and those with low thinking ability in favour of the high thinking ability group as shown in table 9.

Table (9): The t-test for the Mean Differences Between Subjects of High Thinking Ability and Those of Low Thinking Ability

Groups	N	$\bar{X}$	S D	F	t-test
High Thinking Ability	134	65.26	13.64	1.23	3.52**
Low Thinking Ability	125	56.80	16.02		

** Significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis five: There is no significant difference in the mean scores of males and that of females. Using ANOVA (2x2) indicated that significant mean differences exist between males and females as shown in table 10. However, no significant mean differences were found between the two approaches. This result adds support to the previous findings shown in table 3, P. 13; table 4, P. 13; table 6, P. 15; and table 8, P. 16. Therefore, hypothesis five was partly supported and partly rejected.

Table (10): ANOVA (2x2) for the Deductive and the Inductive Groups and Sex

Source	SS	d.f.	MS	F
Approaches	682.01	1	682.01	2.90
Sex	1191.47	1	1191.47	4.67*
Interaction	146.69	1	146.69	0.58
Within Groups	59873.95	259-4= 255	234.80	

* Significant at the .05 level.

To investigate the correlation between the grammar variable and sex, the multiple partial coefficient of correlation was used. It was .53.

To identify the mean difference, if any, existed between males and females, table 11 shows the results of using the t-test.

Table (11): The t-test for the Mean Differences Between Males and Females

Groups	N	$\bar{X}$	S D	F	t-test
Males	116	59.30	15.77	1.11	1.56
Females	143	62.70	14.99		

The above table indicated no significant differences between males and females. However, the findings of using ANOVA showed that significant differences between the two sexes exist.

Hypothesis Six: There is no significant interaction between the two approaches and general intelligence, verbal ability, thinking ability and sex. As indicated in table 4, P. 13; table 6, P. 15; and table 10, P. 18, the results of using ANOVA (2x2) showed no significant interaction between the two approaches and general intelligence as well as verbal ability. Significant interaction, however, was found between the two approaches and thinking ability as shown in table 8, P. 16. Accordingly Hypothesis Six was partly Supported and partly rejected.

Hypothesis Seven: There is no significant bilateral relationship between the two approaches and general intelligence, verbal ability, thinking ability and the whole sample. To investigate the validity of hypothesis seven, this author calculated the correlation coefficients between general intelligence, verbal ability, thinking ability for the two groups taught by both the deductive and the inductive approaches and for the whole sample. The findings are shown in tables 12, 13 and 14.

Table (12): Matrix of Correlation for the Deductive Approach and General Intelligence, Verbal Ability and Thinking Ability

Variables	(1) Approach	(2) Intelligence	(3) Verbal Ability	(4) Thinking Ability	N
1	--	0.18*			
2		--	0.18*		121
3			--	0.04	
4				--	

* Significant at the .05 level.

Table 12 indicated that there is a positive correlation between the grammar variable and general intelligence for the group taught by the deductive approach. This correlation, however, is low since the square of the alienation coefficient is .97; there is a positive correlation between the grammar variable and verbal ability. This correlation, however, is low since the square of the alienation coefficient is .97; and that there is no positive correlation between the grammar variable and thinking ability.

Table (13): Matrix of Correlation for the Inductive Approach and General Intelligence, Verbal Ability and Thinking Ability

Variables	(1) Approach	(2) Intelligence	(3) Verbal Ability	(4) Thinking Ability	N
1	--	0.27**			
2		--	0.40**		138
3			--	0.34**	
4				--	

** Significant at the .01 level.

The above table showed that there is a positive correlation between the grammar variable and general intelligence for the group taught by the inductive approach. This correlation, however, is low since the square of alienation coefficient is .93; there is a positive correlation between the grammar variable and verbal ability. However, this correlation is low since the square of alienation coefficient is .84; and that there is a positive correlation between the grammar variable and thinking ability. Again, this correlation is low since the square of alienation coefficient is .88.

Table (14): Matrix of Correlation for the Whole Sample and General Intelligence, Verbal Ability, and Thinking Ability

Variables	(1) Approach	(2) Intelligence	(3) Verbal Ability	(4) Thinking Ability	N
1	--	0.17**			
2		--	0.32**		259
3			--	0.19**	
4				--	

** Significant at the .01 level.

The above matrix of correlation indicated that there is a positive correlation between the grammar variable and general intelligence of the whole sample taught by the two approaches. This correlation, however, is low since the square of the alienation coefficient is .97; there is a positive correlation between the grammar variable and verbal of the whole sample. However, this correlation is low since the square of the alienation coefficient is .90; and that there is a positive correlation between the grammar variable and thinking ability. Again, this correlation is low since the square of the alienation coefficient is .98. Therefore, hypothesis seven was partly supported and partly rejected.

Discussion:

The findings obtained will be discurssed in four successive parts. The first part deals with the results of the two approaches employed in teaching the two experimental groups, the second part is mainly devoted to the impact of

general intelligence, verbal ability and thinking ability on the two approaches, the third part discusses the results of the differences between males and females, and the fourth part focuses on the correlation between the two approaches, general intelligence, verbal ability, thinking ability and the whole sample.

I- Results pertinent to the two approaches:

The results of using ANOVA (2x2) and the t-test indicated no significant differences between the two approaches. It is no wonder that there was no difference between the deductive and the inductive approaches in teaching the grammatical structures of the language to EFL learners. This may be due to differences in the learners' cognitive styles. Many learners may acquire a clear idea of the grammatical rules of the language simply by seeing them in a very large number of sentences, while other learners may learn best by having the rule presented and then being allowed to demonstrate their comprehension by applying it to new sentences. At this point, Finocchiaro and Bonomo (1973, P. 23) maintained that learners have different learning abilities and may come to our classes with different degrees of skill. They added that learners learn in different ways and at different rates. Some learn by intensive repetition, and over-learning; some learn best by trial and error, and some learn by applying generalizations to new situations. Krashen (1981) also pointed out that "we learn by consciously attending to form, by reading about or listening to explanations of rules (deductive) or figuring out rules (inductive) and by having our errors corrected" (P. 99). To add, El-Sayed (1975, P. 275) in his book "The Psychological Foundations of Development", cited Miller and Tanner who stated that an individual's reasoning tends to be deductive at the period of adolescence, then develops into an inductive one and grows until it reaches

a constant level of intellectual flexibility that helps the adolescent confront situations with the ideal approach whether it is a deductive or an inductive one. This may be applied to the subjects employed in this study who are still in their late adolescence. Accordingly, some learners may learn best the grammar of the language through learning the rule deductively first and then being allowed to apply it to many new examples. On the contrary, many learners may also learn best through active participation in forming the grammatical rules inductively. In other words, the deductive or the inductive approach may seem to be the easiest way to learn to some learners and the most difficult to some other learners. This , of course, depends wholly on learners' learning capacities and degrees of skill or cognitive abilities.

In this concern, this author would like to cite the results of an interesting study by Hartnett (1974) who found significant interaction between brain hemispheric dominance and the effectiveness of inductive and deductive teaching of Spanish. Hartnett found out that inductive learning was as effective or more effective than deductive learning for right hemisphere dominant learners.

On the other hand, deductive learning was as effective or more effective than inductive learning for left hemisphere dominant learners.

On the basis of these findings, Hartnett and this author agree that since language teaching situations do not allow for the segregation of learners according to brain hemisphere dominance, a course designed to best meet the needs of all learners would have to be one which included both deductive and inductive presentations of language learning.

To add, Levin (1972) reported the results of a Swedish research project. Three types of audiolingual oriented approaches to the teaching of English were compared: (1) inductive without generalizations; (2) deductive with generalizations in English; (3) deductive with generalizations in Swedish and comparisons of Swedish and English structures. The results of the project indicated a fairly consistent pattern of (3) over (1) over (2). A deductive approach inclusing explanation in Swedish seemed superior to pure habit formation.

In closing, since grammar is so varied in its nature and usage, different ways of teaching it have to be devised, each way suitable for the different kinds of grammar that have to be learned. Therefore, the best course to take is to encourage both kinds of learning in any given EFL language class, this is because there is not just one way or rather approach of teaching grammar as indicated by the findings of the present study. This point, however, needs further specialized research since our main concern was to determine the differences between the two approaches of teaching.

II- Results related to the impact of general intelligence, verbal ability, and the thinking ability on the two approaches:

Using the ANOVA (2x2) and the t-test showed that the two approaches were effective for learners of (a) high intelligence, (b) high verbal ability and (c) high thinking ability.

(a) Results of Learners with high intelligence:

Many studies (El-Sayed, 1975, P. 275) stated that intelligence is highly correlated with an individual's ability to learn. It is also taken for granted that learners with high intelligence would be better in their performance than those with low intelligence. In addition, reasoning whether it is deductive or inductive basically depends on an individual's

intelligence. Accordingly, the two approaches used in this study, that is, the deductive and the inductive approaches were effective or rather worked best with learners of high intelligence.

In this concern, El-Sheikh (1978, P. 57) also indicated that there is a very high correlation between intelligence and achievement. Therefore, learners of high intelligence are always characterized with high achievement and achieve higher than those of low intelligence.

In addition to this, learning the grammatical rules deductively or inductively requires that the learner perceives relationships and understand different meanings. To do so, the learner must be somewhat intelligent or rather high intelligence is important. Fahmy (1975, P. 302) pointed out that "high intelligence increases an individual's ability to perceive relationships, understand meanings, and perceive the differences between the various meanings".

To conclude, El-Abd (1977, P. 82) put it clearly that "the English language is highly correlated with general intelligence. This is because the English language contains many grammatical rules that require a learner to use his deductive ability". Accordingly, it is obvious that the two approaches would work best with learners of high intelligence.

(b) Results related to Learners with high verbal ability:

It is no wonder that the two approaches worked best with learners with high verbal ability. In fact, it is hard to think without having a complete command over the language of which the verbal ability is one of its components. Since deductive and inductive learning require too much thinking on the part of the learner, learners with very poor language or low verbal ability would be poor thinkers (El-Abd, 1975, P. 236).

Research works (El-Sheikh, 1978, P. 270) confirmed that the language factor is one of the most significant factors responsible for differences between learners in intellectual activities and that language is a complex ability; the verbal ability is one of its constituents. Therefore, one may say that the two approaches can work best with learners of high verbal ability and that learners of high verbal ability would pefform better than those of low verbal ability.

(c) Results related to learners with high thinking ability:

It is taken for granted that learners with high thinking ability would learn best deductively or inductively. This is because both deduction and induction require too much thinking on the part of the learners. El-Sayed (1975, P. 150) pointed out that "deduction and induction are based on an individual's thinking ability". Mansour, et al. (1978) also stated that "thinking is a complex mental process made up of a group of mental processes such as deduction and induction" (P. 196). Accordingly, one may safely say that the two approaches worked better with learners of high thinking ability than those of low thinking ability (El-Sheikh, 1978, P. 58). This point, however, needs a study to determine the mental activities involved in both deduction and induction.

III- Results related to differences between males and females:

Utilizing ANOVA (2x2) revealed significant differences between males and females. The t-test, however, indicated no differences. Statistically speaking, ANOVA is more accurate than the t-test. Therefore, differences exist. This may be due to the fact females are faster than males with regard to language development, verbal ability and comprehension (Fahmy, 1975, P. 302). Therefore, since deduction and induction depend on an individual's language ability, it is expected to

find the two approaches working best with females rather than with males. To add, there is a positive relationship between language ability and intelligence (Fahmy, 1975, P. 302). Since females are much better than males with regard to language ability and comprehension, this may be interpreted that females are more intelligent than males by adolescence (Maccoby and Jacklin, 1974). As deduction and induction largely rely on a learner's intelligence, one may say that the two approaches worked better with females than with males. In closing, this author would like to cite Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) who concluded that females, by adolescence, excel at tasks requiring verbal power, including both receptive and productive language, higher-level verbal tasks, and lower-level fluency measures. One factor underlying female superiority in some aspects of verbal ability may be perceptual speed and accuracy, since females excelled on this measure in all four studies of sex differences cited by Maccoby and Jacklin. Snow (1988, personal commuincation) also stated that it was found that females do better than males in language learning tasks. However, the construct of verbal ability is broad and hence difficult to conceptualize and operationalize. Accordingly, this point needs futher profound research in the field of psychology to uncover the cognitive bases of the diverse verbal skills involved and a study to further determine the differences between males and females taught by both the deductive and the inductive approaches is needed.

IV- Results Related to the correlation between the two approaches and general intelligence, verbal ability, thinking ability and the whole sample.

The findings of calculating the correlation coefficients between general intelligence, verbal ability, thinking ability and the whole sample in the two approaches indicated a positive correlation between these variables and the two

approaches. This may be due to some reasons: (1) most intelligence tests are saturated with verbal ability and thinking ability and as a matter of fact the thinking ability encompasses both deductive and inductive thinking. In addition, most intelligence tests attempt to measure the previously mentioned abilities. For instance, Stanford-Binet Test of Intelligence (El-Kabany, no date) measures a number of complex intellectual functions such as the thinking ability, verbal ability, remembering, etc; Wechsler's Test of Intelligence (Ismail, M. and L. Melakah, 1956) also consists of verbal tests that measure verbal intelligence and practical tests which assess practical intelligence, in addition to, assessing general intelligence. To clarify, El-Kabany's Test of Intelligence for the Secondary Stage (El-Kabany, no date) attempts to measure deductive and inductive reasoning, perceiving verbal relationships, etc; Test of High Intelligence (Khayry, no date) assesses general intelligence represented in deduction and judgment through three types of verbal and numerical situations, etc.; Test of Primary Mental Abilities (Saleh, no date) measures an individual's ability to comprehend, to think, to understand word meanings, etc.; and Mental Readiness Test for the Secondary Schools and Universities (El-Ghareyb, 1963) attempts to measure and individual's ability to comprehend verbal symbols, logic thingking, mathematical thinking, and the ability to perceive relationships. (2) most definitions of intelligence made clear that thinking is one component of intelligence. El-Sayed (1976, P. 202) in Intelligence, cited Herring who studied the different definitions of intelligence and stated that these definitions included a thinking process which encompasses both deductive and inductive reasoning. El-Sayed (1976, P. 203) also cited Teman who defined intelligence as the ability to think in an abstract way; Spearman defined intelligence as the ability to think deductively or inductively; and Meumann stated that intelligence is a general readiness for deductive or inductive

thinking, creative thinking and productive thinking.

In this concern, Mourad (1978, PP. 284-286) maintained that there is a positive correlation between language and thinking. He pointed out that "thinking is a kind of behaviour whose tool is the language". Mourad (1978, P. 287) also made clear that "thinking is a complex mental process which has tools. These are: vocabulary, meanings, and language itself". Therefore, it is obvious that thinking is dependent on an individual's verbal ability. Mourad added that "thinking can not be considered as a social phenomenon unless it depends on the language. This is because language is the link between individuals and groups. Therefore, language is one of the factors of the thinking process and it is the tool with which the mind increases its production and widens its horizon" (P. 306). In conclusion, El-Sayed (1975, P. 157) pointed out that an individual resorts to both approaches, that is, the deductive and the inductive approaches whenever he or she confronts a mental problem. El-Sayed (1975) also cited Thurstone who proved that "an adult's intelligence is made up of primary mental abilities with different ratioes. Of these is the reasoning ability which encompasses both deductive and inductive thinking. These two abilities are highly saturated with intelligence; they reach 84% "(P. 383). (3) the positive correlation between the deductive and the inductive approach and verbal ability (see table 12, P. 19; table 13, P. 20; and table 14, P. 21), may be interpreted that intelligence is a general mental ability made up of some specific abilities and the language or verbal ability is one of these specific abilities that affects an individual's intelligence. Research work conducted by Vernon, Thorndike, Spearman, and Thurstone made clear this point (El-Sayed, 1975, PP. 268-269). To add, studies undertaken by Burt, Brown, Stevenson, Kelley and Thurstone (El-Sheikh, 1978, P. 270), confirmed the existence of the verbal ability and stated that the language factor is

the most responsible factor for individual differences in mental cognitive activities. Thurstone also analyzed the language ability into language factors. These were: verbal comprehension, word fluency, fluency in choosing vocabulary, mental spontaneity in dealing with vocabulary (El-Sheikh, 1978, P. 270). At this point, Carroll analyzed the language ability into some specific abilities. These were: verbal reasoning, the ability to clearly utter words, and the ability to name things (El-Sheikh, 1978, P. 270). To close, Abd El-Salam (1974) carried out a comprehensive study for the factors involved in the language ability using factorial analysis. She found that the language ability is made up of some factors. These were: verbal comprehension, fluency in vocabulary comprehension, grammar and spelling, perceiving language relationships, verbal deduction, verbal induction, etc.

In conclusion, it is no wonder that there was a positive correlation between the two approaches, that is, the deductive and the inductive approaches and general intelligence, verbal ability and thinking ability. This is because both deduction and induction largely depend on an individual's verbal ability, thinking ability and general intelligence as was made clear through the discussion and the interpretation of pertinent findings. It was obvious that the verbal ability and the thinking ability are major components or rather factors of intelligence, and intelligence, in turn, is responsible for an individual's ability to think deductively or inductively according to the nature of the situation he or she confronts. To clarify, this author attempted to interpret the findings of the previous item in a discrete manner just for the sake of clarifying matters. It is not sound to treat an individual's mental abilities as separate entities for they do work toghether in harmony. However, one may say that an individual may be characterized with his or her language intelligence, mathematical intelligence or social

intelligence, etc. To end, this point needs further profound psychological investigation.

Recommendations:

On the basis of the findings and eonclusions of the study, the following recommendations are offered.

- It is recommended that any steps taken to teach the grammatical structures of the language should not be limited to studying the grammatical rule as an end in itself to prove that learners can manipulate rules, but as a structure on which the learners can develop their English language skills.

- It is recommended that any steps taken to teach the grammar of the language should not be confined to utilizing either a deductive approach or an inductive approach but rather making use of both of them as the occasion would seem to demand. For instance, with this sample of learners, because of their grade level (1 st year college freshmen), because they tend to have a strong deductive approach to grammar, a deductive approach would on occasion seem appropriate. These learners often want to know the rules of the foreign language and they are eager and enthusiastic to learn. These EFL learners could be described as being anxious to comprehend the more complex aspects of the grammar system. A deductive approach would be relevant with this group. Interest in many grammatical structures will develop more naturally from the activities of listening, speaking, reading and writing and this interest should be built upon utilizing the inductive approach whenever possible.

- It is interesting to point out that one of the most significant lessons to learn from EFL teaching today is to make use of what is relevant when it is relevant, and so not

try to oblige or compel learners to learn in any one particular way. Thus one can take from each methodology what is appropriate at the time as Newton (1979) suggests, "adapt, not adopt" (P. 24).

- In conclusion, it is recommended that a course designed to best meet the needs of all learners would have to be one which included both deductive and inductive presentations of language learning task. In other words, the best course to take to put an end to such persistent problem is to encourage both kinds of learning in any given EFL classroom.

REFERENCES

Abbott, G. and P. Wingard. The Teaching of English as an International Language. London: Collins, 1981.

Abd El-Salam, N. An Experimental Study for Factors Involved in the Language Ability Using Factorial Analysis. Unpublished Ph.D Dissertation, Ain Shams University, College for Women, 1974. (in Arabic)

Allen, G. and R. Valette. Classroom Techniques: Foreign Languages and English as a Second Language. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1977.

Carroll, J. Current Issues in Psycholinguistics and Second Language Teaching. TESOL Quarterly, 5, 1971.

Celce-Murcia, M. and L. McIntosh. Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language. Rowley, Mass.: Newburry House, 1979.

Chapman, L. Teaching English to Beginners. In Raja T. Nasr, Teaching and Learning English: Selected and Simplified Readings. London: Longman, 1979.

Chastain, K. The Development of Modern Language Skills: Theory to Practice. Philadelphia: The Centre for Curriculum Development, 1971.

Diller, K. Linguistic Theories of Language Acquisition. In Hester, ed., 1970; and Diller, K. Generative Grammar, Structural Linguistics and Language Teaching. Rowley, Mass.: Newburry House, 1971.

Dixon, R. Tests and Drills in English Grammar: Book I. New York: Regents Publishing Co., Inc., 1972.

Dixon, R. Tests and Drills in English Grammar: Book 2. New York: Regents Publishing Co., Inc., 1972.

El-Abd, H. Factorial Analysis of Intellectual Ability and Achievement in the Secondary School and Engineering. In The Second Yearbook of the Egyptian Society for Psychological Studies. Cario : General Organization for Books, 1977. (in Arabic)

--------, Thinking as a Science. Cairo: Anglo-Egyptian Bookshop, 1975. (in Arabic) It is originally written by Henry Hazlitt and translated by Hamid El Abd.

El-Ghareyb, R. Test of Mental Readiness for the Secondary Stage and Universities. Cairo: Al-Bayan Al-Araby, 1963. (in Arabic)

El-Kabany, I. Stanford-Binet Test of Intelligence. Cairo: Committee of Translation and Publishing, no date. (in Arabic)

El-Sayed, F. Psychological Foundations of Development. Cairo: Dar El-Fikr El-Araby, 1975. (in Arabic)

------, Intelligence. Cairo: Dar El-Fikr El-Araby, 1976. (in Arabic)

El-Sheikh, S. Individual Differences in Intelligence. Cario: Dar Al-Thakafa for Printing and Publishing, 1978. (in Arabic)

Fahmy, M. Psychology: Its Foundations and Educational Applications. Cairo: El-Khangy Bookshop, 1975. (in Arabic)

Finocchiaro, M. and M. Bonomo. The Foreign Language Learner: A Guide for Teachers. New York: Regents Publishing company, Inc., 1973.

Gurrey, P. Teaching English as a foreign Language. New Impression, London ₴ Longman, 1973.

----------, The Teaching of Grammar. In Raja T. Nasr. Teaching and Learning English. London: Longman, 1979.

Hartnett, D. The Reletion of Cognitive Style and Hemispheric Language Learning. Paper presented at UCLA conference on Human Brain Function, Los Angeles, 1974.

Hinkle, D.; W. Wiersma; and S.G. Jurs. Applied statistics for the Behavioural Sciences. Chicago: Rand Mc Nally Publishing Co., 1979.

Ismail, M. and L. Milekah. Wechsler Test of Intelligence for Adults and Adolescents. Cairo: Al-Nahdah Al-Misruuah Bookshop. 1956.

Jespersen, O. The Philosophy of Grammar. London: Allen and Unwin, 1972.

Khayry, El-Sayed, M. Test of High Intelligence. Cairo: Dar El-Nahdah Al-Arabiah, no date. (in Arabic)

Krashen, S. Effective Second Language Acquisition: Insights from Research. In Alatis, J. The Second Language Classroom: Directions for the 1980's. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Lado, R. Materials Design: Issues for the 1980's An American Point of View. In Alatis, J. The Second Language Classroom: Directions for the 1980's. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Larsen-Freeman, D. Issues in the Teaching of Grammar. In Celce-Murcie and McIntosh (Eds.) Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language. Mass.: Newburry House Publishers, Inc., 1979.

Levin, L. Comparative Studies in Foreign Language Teaching: The Gumé Project. Stockholm: Al mquist and Wiksell, 1972.

Maccoby, E. and Jacklin, C. The Psychology of Sex Differences. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1974.

Mansour, T.; El-Sharkawy, A. et al. Foundations of General Psychology. Cairo: The Anglo-Egyptian Bookshop. 1978, (in Arabic)

Mourad, Y.Principles of General Psychology. Cairo: Dar Al-Maaref, 1978. (in Arabic)

NewMark, L. How Not to Interfer with Language learning. International Journal of American Linguistics, 32, 1966. Reprinted in Allen, H. and Campbell, R. Teaching English as a Second Language. 2 nd ed., New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1972.

Newton, A. Current Trends in Language Teaching. In Celce-Murcia and McIntosh (eds.). Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language. Rowley, Mass.: Newburry House Publishers, Inc., 1979.

Paulston, C. and M. Bruder, Teaching English as a Second Language: Techniques and Procedures. Cambridge, Mass.: Winthrop, 1976.

Rivers, W. and M. Temperley, A practical Guide to the teaching of English as a Second or Foreign Language . New York: Oxford University press, 1978.

Rivers, W. Teaching Foreign Language Skills. Chicago: The University of Chicago press, 1981.

Saleh, A. Test of Primary Mental Abilities. Cairo: Al-Nahdah Al-Misryyah Bookshop, no date. (in Arabic)

Snow, R.: Professor of Education and Psychology, Stanford University, Stanford, California, 1988.

West, M. How Much English Grammar. In Nasr, R. Teaching and Learning English. London: Longman, 1979.

APPENDIX (A)

TANTA UNIVERSITY LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY TEST OF ENGLISH SYNTAX FOR NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS

A. I - FORM OF TEST

A. II - ANSWER SHEET

A. III - ANSWER KEY

Tanta University
Faculty of Education

Tanta University Language Proficiency Test of English Syntax for Non-Native Speakers

By

Adel I. El-Banna, Ph.D.
EFL Teaching & Testing

Copyright (c) 1985
By Adel I. El-Banna

Tanta University Language Proficiency Test of English Syntax For Non-Native Speakers of English

By

Adel Ibrahim El-Banna, Ph.D.

General Directions:

1- Turn this page when the examiner tells you to do so. This test consists of 100 items and requires approximately 60 minutes of working time.

2- Read the directions which are printed at the beginning of the test carefully, and proceed at once to answer the questions. Do Not spend too much time on Any one item. There is a time limit for each item.

3- No questions may be asked after the examination has begun.

4- Do Not talk to any one during the test.

5- You must mark all your answers on the separate answer sheet you have been given by putting a circle around the same letter (A, B, C, D) as the answer you have chosen.

6- Mark Only One answer for each question.

7- If you make a mistake or wish to change an answer, be sure to Cross Out your first circle and then put another circle around the letter of the answer you prefer.

Do Not turn this page untill you are kindly told to do so.

When you are told to turn the page, read the directions and then go on to the questions.

8- Good Luck !

Tanta University Language Proficiency Test of English Syntax

(60 Minutes)

Instructions:

This is a test to see how well you can manipulate the grammatical structures of the English language. There are 100 incomplete sentences. Four words or phrases marked (a), (b), (c), and (d) are given beneath the sentence. You have to choose the One best word or phrase that completes the sentence. Do not spend too much time on any one item or you will not have time to finish.

Examples:

1- Cairo tower is the ------ tower in Egypt.

(a) famousest (c) more famous

(b) most famous (d) famous

2- I haven't talked to Ahmed ------- two weeks.

(a) since (c) ago

(b) during (d) for

Correct answers:

1- (a) (b) (c) (d) 2- (a) (b) (c) (d)

To show that b and d are the correct ansewrs, a circle has been made around the letters (b) in example 1, and (d) in example 2. Then, on your answer sheet, mark the letters indicating the correct answers.

Answer all the questions of this test in this manner.

TANTA UNIVERSITY LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY TEST OF ENGLISH SYNTAX

By
Adel I. El-Banna, Ph.D.

1. Hany ------- seventeen years old.
   a) am b) be c) is d) are
2. Salem and Sally ------ cousins.
   a) are b) am c) be d) is
3. You ------ busy.
   a) am b) are c) is d) be
4. --------- I a teacher?
   a) Are b) Am c) Be d) Is
5. --------- the doctors in the hospital?
   a) Am b) Are c) Be d) Is
6. Nora is ------- lovely girl.
   a) a b) tall c) very d) an
7. There are 60 minutes in ------- hour.
   a) an b) a c) some d) new
8. I see ------- books on the desk.
   a) a b) an c) one d) the
9. He is talking to two ------- right now.
   a) man b) men c) person d) child
10. The ------- are in the dining room.
    a) woman b) women c) girl d) man
11. I -------- free at the moment.
    a) aren't b) isn't c) am not d) is not
12. -------- Mr. Hady a teacher?
    a) Am not b) Are not c) Aren't d) Isn't
13. -------- schools are not told.
    a) That b) Those c) This d) It
14. -------- aren't books. They're notebooks.
    a) It b) That c) This d) These

Please go on to the next page

15. Mr. Hany -------- in Cairo now.
a) is living b) am living c) are living d) live

16. Rady and I -------- English at this moment.
a) is studying b) am studying c) are studying d) studies

17. Balteem is a city. ----- in Kafr El-Sheikh.
a) It b) He's c) Its d) It's

18. Please give -------- the book.
a) It b) you c) me d) I

19. Hamed sits in front of ---------.
a) her b) she c) I d) we

20. I play with -------- everyday.
a) us b) them c) they d) I

21. -------- is working in the hospital? The doctor.
a) Who b) Where c) When d) Why

22. -------- is our English class? In room 4.
a) Where b) Why c) What d) Who

23. -------- are we going home today? By bus.
a) How b) Where c) Who d) What

24. Does your father -------- in an office?
a) is working b) work c) works d) are working

25. Do the children -------- milk everyday?
a) drink b) is drinking c) drinks d) are drinking

26. Adel Kamal -------- English everyday.
a) speaking b) speak c) to speak c) speaks

27. You -------- the newspaper every morning.
a) read b) reads c) to read d) reading

28. -------- we need for the English class?
a) What do b) What does c) What d) What is

29. -------- they have English class?
a) When b) When do c) When does d) When is

30. -------- you feel today?
a) How does b) How is c) How d) How do

Please go on to the next page

31. Ali and Aziza -------- home last Monday.
a) is b) are c) was d) were

32. Nady -------- busy last night.
a) are b) were c) is d) was

33. Yesterday, I -------- four kilometers.
a) walk b) walked c) walking d) walks

34. They -------- carefully for the test two days ago.
a) study b) studying c) studied d) studies

35. Did the class -------- to the explanation?
a) listens b) listen c) listened d) listening

36. Salwa -------- a letter to her brother last month.
a) wrote b) writes c) is writing d) writing

37. He -------- for eight hours last night.
a) slept b) sleeps c) sleeping d) am sleeping

38. The book belongs to me. It's ----------.
a) my b) mine c) their d) her

39. The books are Sally's and Shady's. They are ------ books.
a) theirs b) our c) their d) there

40. Adel Kamal's pen is on the table. It's -------- pen.
a) he b) ours c) his d) him

41. I -------- last Monday.
a) was working b) working
c) were working d) am working

42. Salem and I -------- ball yesterday.
a) plays b) was playing c) playing d) were playing

43. They studied for the test, ---------- ?
a) don't they b) did they c) are they c) didn't they

44. Your father works for El-Nasr company, ---------- ?
a) doesn't b) isn't he c) didn't he c) does he

45. There is no study tomorrow, --------- ?
a) was there b) isn't it c) is there d) doesn't

Please go on to the next page

46. -------- jacket are you wearing now?
a) Whose b) Who c) Who's d) Whom

47. My father didn't want me to -------- out late last night.
a) staying b) stayed c) stay d) stays

48. Did Mr. Adel tell us -------- for a test tomorrow?
a) to study b) studies c) studying d) studied

49. Do you like -------- at the beach or at the pool?
a) swims b) to swim c) swim d) swam

50. Do you want -------- Japanese food or Egyptian food?
a) eats b) eat c) to eat d) eating

51. -------- money do you need for a trip to Luxor?
a) A few b) How much c) How many d) A lot of

52. -------- students are in your English class?
a) How many b) How often c) How long d) How much

53. We have a test tomorrow so we -------- to study.
a) should b) have c) will d) can

54. Everyone outside is wearing a coat. It ----- be cold out.
a) would b) have to c) must d) ought

55. May I -------- to the party, mother?
a) go b) will go c) going d) goes

56. -------- go to Aswan next year with their friends.
a) He's b) We're c) She's d) They'll

57. The students -------- take a class trip next term.
a) going b) are going to c) is going to d) are going

58. This tree is as -------- as that one.
a) very tall b) tall c) tallest d) taller

59. She is as --------- as Maha.
a) very pretty b) pretty c) prettier d) prettiest

60. Sally is -------- than Sarah.
a) happy b) happiest c) very happy d) happier

Please go on to the next page

61. Nady is the -------- of all the boys in the class.
a) clever b) cleverer c) cleverest d) very clever

62. Hamed doesn't have -------- money.
a) some b) any c) no d) every

63. My sister needs -------- eggs for the cake.
a) some b) none c) every d) any

64. My English class is --------- my Arabic class
a) difficult as b) difficult than
c) more difficult than d) more difficult

65. Cairo is -------- than Kafr El-Sheikh.
a) modern b) as modern
c) more modern d) most modern

66. My uncle is -------- person in my family.
a) less intelligent than b) as intelligent
c) the most intelligent d) more intelligent than

67. English is -------- class we have.
a) the most difficult b) more difficult
c) more difficult than d) as difficult

68. May was a good month but August was ------ than May.
a) good b) best c) more d) better

69. My friends -------- in Kafr El-Sheikh since 1985.
a) had lived b) live c) have lived d) living

70. Nady --------- Aswan yet this year.
a) visited b) visits
c) hasn't visited d) have visited.

71. The football player -------- hit by the ball.
a) were b) will c) has d) was

72. We -------- homework by our teachers everyday.
a) are giving b) were giving c) are given d) is given

73. The children -------- for telling their mother a lie.
a) is punished b) was punishing
c) were punished d) was punished

Please go on to the next page

74. If he were rich, he -------- buy me a new car.
a) may b) does c) can d) would

75. If I study a lot I -------- pass this test.
a) did b) am c) will d) should

76. If they studied every day, they ------ fail the tests.
a) shouldn't b) can't c) don't d) mustn't

77. I -------- go unless I finish my homework first.
a) won't b) didn't c) aren't d) isn't

78. Before they left, they -------- the whole cake.
a) have eaten b) are eating c) had eaten d) eat

79. You -------- the board before the teacher arrived.
a) erase b) are erasing c) are erased d) had erased

80. The car is parked -------- the house.
a) outside b) among c) on d) into

81. The runner ran -------- the playground five times.
a) on b) with c) around d) after

82. I usually see my good friends -------- dinner time.
a) beneath b) during c) beside d) inside

83. This secret should remain -------- you and me.
a) through b) among c) within d) between

84. Ricky is American. He comes -------- America.
a) in b) from c) at d) on

85. Gerogory lives --------- 6 Glen Cove street.
a) in b) on c) at d) of

86. The Baechers live -------- Main street.
a) on b) at c) to d) in

87. Gamal works -------- Cairo city.
a) to b) at c) on d) in

88. My friend Hady lives -------- the farm.
a) on b) in c) at d) to

89. As I --------, I suddenly remembered my friend's name.
a) to feed my cats b) am feeding my cats
c) had fed my cats d) was feeding my cats

Please go on to the next page

90. I have been trying to telephone her ------ the past week.
a) for b) since c) through d) inside

91. I could have done better if I -------- more time.
a) have had b) had
c) had had d) will have had

92. While he ------ the map, a door somewhere behind him opened.
a) is looking at b) did look at
c) looked carefully upon d) was looking at

93. Kamel's shirt was torn -------- up the tree.
a) while climbing b) while he was climbing
c) in climbing d) upon climbing

94. I would have said "Hello" if I -------- your brother.
a) could see b) had seen
c) will see d) will have seen

95. We haven't seen you ---------- .
a) in the past two years b) last two years
c) since two years d) two years ago

96. A friend -------- mine is a good teacher.
a) for b) of c) in d) off

97. The floor ---------- the sink is wet.
a) under b) over c) from d) on

98. "What happened"? "The house ---------- by the wind".
a) blew down b) was blown to down
c) was blown down d) was to blown down

99. "Is Nady in his room?" I don't know. I haven't --------- him for 3 hours.
a) saw b) see c) seen d) seeing

100. This lesson is --------- for me to study.
a) too difficult b) to difficult
c) so difficult d) difficult enough

END OF TEST
Check Your Answers
Be sure that your name
has been written on
your answer sheet.

Name: Class: School:

Answer Sheet

1.	a	b	c	d	34.	a	b	c	d	67.	a	b	c	d
2.	a	b	c	d	35.	a	b	c	d	68.	a	b	c	d
3.	a	b	c	d	36.	a	b	c	d	69.	a	b	c	d
4.	a	b	c	d	37.	a	b	c	d	70.	a	b	c	d
5.	a	b	c	d	38.	a	b	c	d	71.	a	b	c	d
6.	a	b	c	d	39.	a	b	c	d	72.	a	b	c	d
7.	a	b	c	d	40.	a	b	c	d	73.	a	b	c	d
8.	a	b	c	d	41.	a	b	c	d	74.	a	b	c	d
9.	a	b	c	d	42.	a	b	c	d	75.	a	b	c	d
10.	a	b	c	d	43.	a	b	c	d	76.	a	b	c	d
11.	a	b	c	d	44.	a	b	c	d	77.	a	b	c	d
12.	a	b	c	d	45.	a	b	c	d	78.	a	b	c	d
13.	a	b	c	d	46.	a	b	c	d	79.	a	b	c	d
14.	a	b	c	d	47.	a	b	c	d	80.	a	b	c	d
15.	a	b	c	d	48.	a	b	c	d	81.	a	b	c	d
16.	a	b	c	d	49.	a	b	c	d	82.	a	b	c	d
17.	a	b	c	d	50.	a	b	c	d	83.	a	b	c	d
18.	a	b	c	d	51.	a	b	c	d	84.	a	b	c	d
19.	a	b	c	d	52.	a	b	c	d	85.	a	b	c	d
20.	a	b	c	d	53.	a	b	c	d	86.	a	b	c	d
21.	a	b	c	d	54.	a	b	c	d	87.	a	b	c	d
22.	a	b	c	d	55.	a	b	c	d	88.	a	b	c	d
23.	a	b	c	d	56.	a	b	c	d	89.	a	b	c	d
24.	a	b	c	d	57.	a	b	c	d	90.	a	b	c	d
25.	a	b	c	d	58.	a	b	c	d	91.	a	b	c	d
26.	a	b	c	d	59.	a	b	c	d	92.	a	b	c	d
27.	a	b	c	d	60.	a	b	c	d	93.	a	b	c	d
28.	a	b	c	d	61.	a	b	c	d	94.	a	b	c	d
29.	a	b	c	d	62.	a	b	c	d	95.	a	b	c	d
30.	a	b	c	d	63.	a	b	c	d	96.	a	b	c	d
31.	a	b	c	d	64.	a	b	c	d	97.	a	b	c	d
32.	a	b	c	d	65.	a	b	c	d	98.	a	b	c	d
33.	a	b	c	d	66.	a	b	c	d	99.	a	b	c	d
										100.	a	b	c	d

END OF TEST

Tanta University Language Proficiency Test of English Syntax

(Answer Key)

1.	c	34.	d	67.	a				
2.	a	35.	b	68.	d				
3.	b	36.	a	69.	c				
4.	b	37.	a	70.	c				
5.	b	38.	b	71.	d				
6.	a	39.	c	72.	c				
7.	a	40.	c	73.	c				
8.	d	41.	a	74.	d				
9.	b	42.	d	75.	c				
10.	b	43.	d	76.	a				
11.	c	44.	a	77.	a				
12.	d	45.	b	78.	c				
13.	b	46.	a	79.	d				
14.	d	47.	c	80.	a				
15.	a	48.	a	81.	c				
16.	c	49.	b	82.	b				
17.	d	50.	c	83.	d				
18.	c	51.	b	84.	b				
19.	a	52.	a	85.	c				
20.	b	53.	b	86.	b				
21.	a	54.	c	87.	d				
22.	a	55.	a	88.	a				
23.	a	56.	d	89.	d				
24.	b	57.	b	90.	b				
25.	a	58.	b	91.	c				
26.	d	59.	b	92.	d				
27.	a	60.	d	93.	b				
28.	a	61.	c	94.	b				
29.	b	62.	b	95.	c				
30.	d	63.	a	96.	b				
31.	d	64.	c	97.	a				
32.	d	65.	c	98.	c				
33.	b	66.	c	99.	c				
				100.	a				